At a Meeting of the Connecticut Society of Arts and Sciences, *held by adjournment in the city of New-Haven, on the 23d Day of October.* A. D. 1787.

THE Rev. Doctor *Edwards* communicated to the Society a Diſſertation on the Indian Language, with Obſervations on its Analogy to the Hebrew, and was deſired to lodge the ſame with the Secretary to be publiſhed.

A true Copy of Record,

Teſt

CHAUNCEY GOODRICH *Rec. Sec'y.*

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

LANGUAGE

OF THE

MUHHEKANEEW INDIANS;

IN WHICH THE EXTENT OF THAT LANGUAGE IN NORTH-AMERICA IS SHEWN; ITS GENIUS IS GRAMMATICALLY TRACED: SOME OF ITS PECULIARITIES, AND SOME INSTANCES OF ANALOGY BETWEEN THAT AND THE HEBREW ARE POINTED OUT.

COMMUNICATED TO THE CONNECTICUT SOCIETY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AND PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE SOCIETY.

BY JONATHAN EDWARDS, D. D.

PASTOR OF A CHURCH IN NEW-HAVEN, AND MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT SOCIETY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

NEW-HAVEN, Printed by JOSIAH MEIGS,

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

PREFACE.

THAT the following observations may obtain credit, it may be proper to inform the reader, with what advantages they have been made.

When I was but six years of age, my father removed with his family to Stockbridge, *which at that time, was inhabited by Indians almost solely; as there were in the town but twelve families of whites or Anglo-Americans, and perhaps one hundred and fifty families of Indians The Indians being the nearest neighbours, I constantly associated with them; their boys were my daily school mates and play-fellows. Out of my father's house, I seldom heard any language spoken, beside the Indian. By these means I acquired the knowledge of that language, and a great facility in speaking it. It became more familiar to me than my mother tongue. I knew the names of some things in Indian, which I did not know in English; even all my thoughts ran in Indian: and though the true pronunciation of the language is extremely difficult to all but themselves, they acknowledged, that I had acquired it perfectly; which as they said, never had been acquired before by any Anglo-American. On account of this acquisition, as well as on account of my skill in their language in general, I received from them many compliments applauding my superior wisdom. This skill in their language I have in a good measure retained to this day.*

After I had drawn up these observations, lest there should be some mistakes in them, I carried them to Stockbridge, and read them to Capt. Yōghum, *a principal Indian of the tribe, who is well versed in his own language, and tolerably informed concerning the English: and I availed myself of his remarks and corrections.*

From these facts, the reader will form his own opinion of the truth and accuracy of what is now offered him.

When I was in my tenth year, my father sent me among the six nations, with a design that I should learn their lan-

guage,

guage, and thus become qualified to be a miſſionary among them. But on account of the war with France, which then exiſted, I continued among them but about ſix months. Therefore the knowledge which I acquired of that language was but imperfect; and at this time I retain ſo little of it, that I will not hazard any particular critical remarks on it. I may obſerve however, that though the words of the two languages are totally different, yet their ſtructure is in ſome reſpects analogous, particularly in the uſe of prefixes and ſuffixes.

Obſervations, &c.

THE language which is now the ſubject of obſervation is that of the *Muhhekaneew* or Stockbridge Indians. They, as well as the tribe at New-London, are by the Anglo-Americans, called *Mohegans*, which is a corruption of *Muhhekaneew* *, in the ſingular, or *Muhhekaneok* in the plural. This language is ſpoken by all the Indians throughout New-England. Every tribe, as that of Stockbridge, that of Farmington, that of New-London &c. has a different dialect; but the language is radically the ſame. Mr. Elliot's tranſlation of the bible is in a particular dialect of this language. The dialect followed in theſe obſervations, is that of Stockbridge. This language appears to be much more extenſive than any other language in North-America. The languages of the Delawares, in Pennſylvania, of the Penobſcots bordering on Nova-Scotia, of the Indians of St. Francis in Canada, of the Shawaneſe on the Ohio, and of the Chippewaus at the weſtward of lake Huron, are all radically the ſame with the Mohegan. The ſame is ſaid concerning the languages of the Ottowaus, Nanticooks, Munſees, Menomonees, Meſſiſaugas, S ukies, Ottagaumies, Killiſtinoes, Nipegons, Algonkins, Winnebagoes, &c. That the languages of the ſeveral tribes in New-England, of the Delawares, and of Mr. Elliot's bible, are radically the ſame with the Mohegan, I aſſert from my own knowledge

* Wherever *w* occurs in an Indian word, it is a mere conſonant, as in *work*, *world*, &c.

ledge. What I aſſert concerning the language of the Penobſcots, I have from a Gentleman in Maſſachuſetts, who has been much converſant among the Indians. That the languages of the Shawaneſe and Chippewaus is radically the ſame with the Mohegan, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew. My authorities for what I ſay of the languages of the other nations are Capt. *Yoghum*, before mentioned, and *Carver's travels*.

To illuſtrate the analogy between the *Mohegan*, the *Shawanee*, and the *Chippewau* languages, I ſhall exhibit a ſhort liſt of words of thoſe three languages. For the liſt of *Mohegan* words I myſelf am accountable. That of the *Shawanee* words was communicated to me by General *Parſons*, who has had opportunity to make a partial vocabulary of that language. For the words of the *Chippewau* language I am dependent on *Carver's Travels*.

Engliſh.	*Mohegan.*	*Shawanee.*
A Bear	Mquoh	Mauquah
A beaver	Amiſque *	Amaquah
Eye	Hkeeſque	Skeeſacoo
Ear	Towohque	Towacah
Fetch	Pautoh	Peatoloo
My Grandfather	Nemoghhome †	Nemaſompethau
My Grandmother	Nohhum	Nocumthau
My Granchild	Naughees	Nooſthethau
He goes	Pumiſſoo	Pomthalo
A girl	Peeſquauſoo	Squauthauthau
Houſe	Weekumuhm	Weecuah
He (that man)	Uwoh	Welah
His head	Weenſis	Weeſeh (I imagine misſpelt, for weenſeh.)

Engliſh.

* *e* final is never ſounded in any Indian word, which I write, except monoſyllables.

† *gh* in any Indian word has the ſtrong guttural ſound, which is given by the Scots to the ſame letters in the words *tough*, *enough*, &c.

Engliſh	*Mohegan*	*Shawanee*
His heart	Utoh	Otaheh
Hair	Weghaukun	Welathoh
Her huſband	Waughecheh	Waſecheh
His teeth	Wepeeton	Wepeetalee
I thank yon	Wneeweh	Neauweh
My uncle	Nſees	Neeſeethau
I	Neah	Nelah
Thou	Keah	Kelah
We	Neaunuh	Nelauweh
Ye	Keauwuh	Kelauweh
Water	Nbey	Nippee
Elder ſiſter	Nmees	Nemeethau
River	Sepoo	Thepee

The following is a ſpecimen of analogy between the Mohegan and Chippewau languages.

Engliſh	*Mohegan*	*Chippiwau.*
A bear	Mquoh	Mackwah
A beaver	Amiſque	Amik
To die (I die)	Nip	Nip
Dead (he is dead)	Nboo or nepoo*	Neepoo
Devil	Mtandou, or Mannito†	Manitou
Dreſs the kettle (make a fire)	Pootouwah	Poutwah
His eyes	Ukeeſquan	Wiſkinkhie
Fire	Stauw	Scutta
Give it him	Meenuh	Millaw
A ſpirit (a ſpectre)	Mannito	Manitou
How	Tuneh ‡	Tawnè

Engliſh

* The firſt ſyllable ſcarcely ſounded.

† The laſt of theſe words properly ſignifies a ſpectre or any thing frightful.

‡ Wherever *u* occurs, it has not the long ſound of the Engliſh *u* as in *commune*; but the ſound of *u* in *uncle*, though much protracted. The other vowels are to be pronounced, as in Engliſh.

Engliſh.	*Mohegan.*	*Chippewan.*
Houſe	Weekumuhm	Wigwaum
An impoſtor (he is an impoſtor or bad man)	Mtiſſoo	Mawlawtiſſie
Go	Pumiſſeh	Pimmouſſie
Marry	Weeween	Weewin
Good for nought	Mtit	Malatat
River	Sepoo	Sippim
Shoe	Mkiſſin	Maukiſſin
The ſun	Keeſogh	Kiſſis
Sit down	Mattipeh	Mintipin
Water	Nbey	Nebbi
Where	Tehah	Tah
Winter	Hpoon	Pepoun
Wood	Metooque	Mittic

Almoſt every man who writes Indian words, ſpells them in a peculiar manner: and I dare ſay, if the ſame perſon had taken down all the words above, from the mouths of the Indians, he would have ſpelt them more alike, and the coincidence would have appeared more ſtriking. Moſt of thoſe who write and print Indian words, uſe the letter *a* where the ſound is that of *oh* or *au*. Hence the reader will obſerve, that in ſome of the Mohegan words above, *o* or *oh* is uſed, when *a* or *ah* is uſed in the correſpondent words of the other languages: as *Mquoh, Mauquah.* I doubt not the ſound of thoſe two ſyllables is exactly the ſame, as pronounced by the Indians of the different tribes.

It is not to be ſuppoſed, that the like coincidence is extended to all the words of thoſe languages. Very many words are totally different. Still the analogy is ſuch as is ſufficient to ſhow, that they are mere dialects of the ſame original language.

I could not throughout, give words of the ſame ſignification in the three languages, as the two vocabularies,

from

from which I extracted the *Shawanee* and *Chippewau* words, did not contain words of the ſame ſignification, excepting in ſome inſtances.

The Mohauk, which is the language of the ſix nations is entirely different from that of the Mohegans. There is no more appearance of a derivation of one of theſe laſt mentioned languages from the other, than there is of a derivation of either of them from the Engliſh. One obvious diverſity, and in which the Mohauk is perhaps different from every other language, is, that it is wholly deſtitute of labials: whereas the Mohegan abounds with labials. I ſhall here give the numerals, as far as ten, and the *Pater noſter*, in both languages.

Mohegan	*Creek*	*Mohauk*
1 Ngwittoh	Hùmga	Uſkot
2 Neeſoh	Hóigla	Teggeneh
3 Noghhoh	Tótkala	Ohs
4 Nauwoh	Hó's ta	Kialeh
5 Nunon	Chàca	Wiſk
6 Ngwittus	Epaùga	Yoiyok
7 Tupouwus	Cóldba	Chautok
8 Ghuſooh	Chénepa	Sottago
9 Nauneeweh	Óstaba	Teuhtoh
10 Mtannit	Epaùla	Wialeh

The Pater noſter in the Mohegan language, is as follows;

Noghnuh, ne ſpummuck oieon, taugh mauweh wneh wtukoſeauk neanne annuwoieon. Taugh ne aunchuwutammun wawehtuſeek maweh noh pummeh. Ne annoihitteech mauweh awauneek noh hkey oiecheek, ne aunchuwutammun, ne aunoihitteet neek ſpummuk oiecheek. Menenaunuh noonooh wuhkamauk tquogh nuh uhhuyutamauk ngummauweh. Ohquutamouwenaunuh auneh mumachoieaukeh, ne anneh ohquutamouwoieauk numpeh neek mumacheh annehoquaukeek. Cheen hquukquaucheh ſiukeh annehenaunuh. Panneeweh htouwenaunuh neen maumtehkeh. Keah ngwehcheh kwiouwauweh mauweh noh pummeh;

ktanwoi;

ktanwoi; eſtah awaun wtinnoiyuwun ne aunoie/on; hanweeweh ne ktinnoieen. Amen.

The Pater Noſter, in the language of the Six Nations, taken from Smith's hiſtory of New-York, is this;

Soungwauneha caurounkyawga tehſeetaroan ſauhſoneyouſta eſa ſawaneyou okettauhſela ehneauwoung na caurounkyawga nughwonſhauga neatewehnefalauga taugwaunautoronoantoughſick toantaugweleewheyouſtaung cheneeyeut chaquataulehwheyouſtaunna toughſou taugwauſſareneh tawautottenaugaloughtoungga naſawne ſacheautaugwaſs coantehſalohaunzaickaw eſa ſawauneyou eſa ſaſhoutzta eſa ſoungwaſoung chenneauhaungwa; auwen.

The reader will obſerve, that there is not a ſingle labial either in the numerals or Pater noſter of this language; and that when they come to *amen*, from an averſion to ſhutting the lips, they change the *m* to *w*.

In no part of theſe languages does there appear to be a greater coincidence, than in this ſpecimen. I have never noticed one word in either of them, which has any analogy to the correſpondent word in the other language.

Concerning the Mohegan language, it is obſervable, that that there is no diverſity of gender, either in nouns or pronouns. The very ſame words expreſs *he* and *ſhe*, *him* and *her*. Hence when the Mohegans ſpeak Engliſh, they generally in this reſpect follow ſtrictly their own idiom: A man will ſay concerning his wife, *he ſick*, *he gone away*, &c.

With regard to *caſes*, they have but one variation from the nominative, which is formed by the addition of the ſyllable *an* as *wnechun*, his child, *wnechunan*. This varied caſe ſeems to ſuit indifferently any caſe, except the nominative.

The plural is formed by adding a letter or ſyllable to the ſingular; as *nemannauw*, a man, *nemannauk*, men; *penumpauſoo*, a boy, *penumpauſoouk*, boys.

The

The Mohegans more carefully diſtinguiſh the natural relations of men to each other, than we do, or perhaps any other nation. They have one word to expreſs an elder brother, *netohcon*; another to expreſs a younger brother, *ngheeſum*. One to expreſs an elder ſiſter, *nmaſe*; another to expreſs a younger ſiſter, *ngheeſum*. But the word for younger brother and younger ſiſter is the ſame,—*Nſaſe* is my uncle by my mother's ſide: *nuchehque* is my uncle by the father's ſide.

The Mohegans have no adjectives in all their language; unleſs we reckon numerals and ſuch words as *all, many*, &c. adjectives. Of adjectives which expreſs the qualities of ſubſtances, I do not find that they have any. They expreſs thoſe qualities by verbs neuter; as *wniſſoo*, he is beautiful; *mtiſſoo*, he is homely; *pehtunquiſſoo* he is tall; *nſconmoo*, he is malicious &c. Thus in Latin many qualities are expreſſed by verbs neuter, as valeo, caleo, frigeo &c.—Although it may at firſt, ſeem not only ſingular, and curious, but impoſſible, that a language ſhould exiſt without adjectives; yet it is an indubitable fact. Nor do they ſeem to ſuffer any inconvenience by it. They as readily expreſs any quality by a neuter verb, as we do by an adjective.

If it ſhould be enquired, how it appears that the words above mentioned are not adjectives: I anſwer it appears, as they have all the ſame variations and declenſions of other verbs. *To walk* will be acknowledged to be a verb. This verb is declined thus; npumſeh, I walk; kpumſeh, thou walkeſt; pumiſſoo, he walketh; npumſehnuh, we walk; kpumſehmuh, ye walk; pumiſſoouk, they walk. In the ſame manner are the words in queſtion declined; npehtuhquiſſeh, I am tall; kpehtuhquiſſeh, thou art tall; pehtuhquiſſoo, he is tall; npehtuhquiſſehnuh, we are tall; kpehtuhquiſſehmuh, ye are tall; pehtuhqueſſoouk, they are tall.

Though the Mohegans have no proper adjectives, they have participles to all their verbs: as pehtuhquiſſeet, the

man

man who is tall: paumſeet, the man who walks; waunſeet, the man who is beautiful; oieet, the man who lives or dwells in a place; oioteet, the man who fights. So in the plural, pehtuhquiſſeecheek, the tall men; paumſeecheek, they who walk, &c.

It is obſervable of the participles of this language, that they are declined through the perſons and numbers, in the ſame manner as verbs: thus, paumſe-uh, I walking; paumſe-an, thou walking; paumſeet, he walking; paumſeauk, we walking; paumſeauque, ye walking; paumſecheek, they walking.

They have no relative correſponding to our *who* or *which*. Inſtead of *the man who walks*, they ſay, the walking man, or the walker.

As they have no adjectives, of courſe they have no compariſon of adjectives; yet they are put to no difficulty to expreſs the comparative excellence or baſeneſs of any two things. With a neuter verb expreſſive of the quality, they uſe an adverb to point out the degree: as annuweeweh wniſſoo, he is more beautiful; kahnuh wniſſoo, he is very beautiful. Nemannauwoo, he is a man: annuweeweh nemannauwoo, he is a man of ſuperior excellence or courage; kahnuh nemannnauwoo, he is a man of extraordinary exccellence or courage.

Beſide the pronouns common in other languages, they expreſs the pronouns both ſubſtantive and adjective, by *affixes*, or by letters or ſyllables added at the beginnings, or ends, or both, of their nouns. In this particular the ſtructure of the language coincides with that of the Hebrew, in an inſtance in which the Hebrew differs from all the languages of Europe, antient or modern. However, the uſe of the affixed pronouns in the Mohegan language, is not perfectly ſimilar to the uſe of them in the Hebrew: As in the Hebrew they are joined to the ends of words only, but in the Mohegan, they are ſometimes joined to the ends, ſometimes to the beginnings, and ſometimes to both. Thus, *tmohhecan* is a hatchet or ax; *ndumhecan* is my hatchet; *ktumhecan*, thy hatchet; *utumhecan*, his

his hatchet; *ndumhecannuh*, our hatchet; *ktumhecanoo-wuh*, your hatchet; *utumhecannoowuh*, their hatchet. It is obſervable, that the pronouns for the ſingular number are prefixed, and for the plural, the prefixed pronouns for the ſingular being retained, there are others added as ſuffixes.

It is further to be obſerved, that by the increaſe of the word the vowels are changed and tranſpoſed; as tmohecan, ndumhecan; the *o* is changed into *u* and tranſpoſed, in a manner analogous to what is often done in the Hebrew. The *t* is changed into *d euphoniæ gratia*.

A conſiderable part of the appellatives are never uſed without a pronoun affixed. The Mohegans can ſay, my father, *nogh*, thy father, *kogh* &c. &c. but they cannot ſay abſolutely *father*. There is no ſuch word in all their language. If you were to ſay *ogh*, which the word would be, if ſtripped of all affixes, you would make a Mohegan both ſtare and ſmile. The ſame obſervation is applicable to *mother, brother, ſiſter, ſon, head, hand, foot, &c.* in ſhort to thoſe things in general which neceſſarily in their natural ſtate belong to ſome perſon. A hatchet is ſometimes found without an owner, and therefore they ſometimes have occaſion to ſpeak of it abſolutely, or without referring it to an owner. But as a *head, hand* &c. naturally belong to ſome perſon, and they have no occaſion to ſpeak of them without referring to the perſon to whom they belong; ſo they have no words to expreſs them abſolutely. This I preſume is a peculiarity in which this language differs from all languages, which have ever yet come to the knowledge of the learned world.

The pronouns are in like manner prefixed and ſuffixed to verbs. The Mohegans never uſe a verb in the infinitive mood, or without a nominative or agent; and never uſe a verb tranſitive without expreſſing, both the agent and the object, correſpondent to the nominative and accuſative caſes in Latin. Thus they can neither ſay, *to love*,

nor

nor *I love, thou giveſt* &c. But they can ſay, *I love thee, thou giveſt him*, &c. viz. *Nduhwhunuw* I love him or her; *nduhwhuntammin* I love it; *ktuhwhunin*, I love thee; *ktuhwhunoohmuh*, I love you, (in the plural) *nduhwhunnuk*, I love them. This, I think, is another peculiarity of this language.

Another peculiarity is, that the nominative and accuſative pronouns prefixed and ſuffixed, are always uſed, even though other nominatives and accuſatives be expreſſed. Thus they cannot ſay, *John loves Peter*; they always ſay, *John he loves him Peter*; *John uduhwhunuw Peteran*. Hence when the Indians begin to talk Engliſh, they univerſally expreſs themſelves according to this idiom.

It is further obſervable, that the pronoun in the accuſative caſe is ſometimes in the ſame inſtance expreſſed by both a prefix and a ſuffix; as *kthuwhunin*, I love thee. The *k* prefixed, and the ſyllable *in*, ſuffixed, both unite to expreſs, and are both neceſſary to expreſs the accuſative caſe *thee*.

They have no verb ſubſtantive in all the language. Therefore they cannot ſay, *he is a man, he is a coward* &c. They expreſs the ſame by one word, which is a verb neuter, viz. *nemannauwoo*, he is a man. *Nemannauw* is the noun ſubſtantive, *man*: that turned into a verb neuter of the third perſon ſingular, becomes *nemannauwoo*, as in Latin it is ſaid, græcor, græcatur &c. Thus they turn any ſubſtantive whatever into a verb neuter: as *kmattanniſſauteuh* you are a coward, from *matanſautee*, a coward: *kpeeſquauſooeh*, you are a girl, from *peeſquauſoo*, a girl*.

Hence alſo we ſee the *reaſon*, why they have no verb ſubſtantive. As they have no adjectives, and as they turn their ſubſtantives into verbs on any occaſion: they have no uſe for the ſubſtantive or auxiliary verb.

The

* The circumſtance that they have no verb ſubſtantive, accounts for their not uſing that verb, when they ſpeak Engliſh. They ſay, *I man, I ſick &c.*

The third perſon ſingular ſeems to be the radix, or moſt ſimple form of the ſeveral perſons of their verbs in the indicative mood: but the ſecond perſon ſingular of the imperative, ſeems to be the moſt ſimple of any of the forms of their verbs: as *meetſeh*, eat thou: *meetſoo*, he eateth: *nmeetſeh*, I eat: *kmeetſeh*, thou eateſt &c.

They have a paſt and future tenſe to their verbs; but often, if not generally, they uſe the form of the preſent tenſe, to expreſs both paſt and future events. As *wnukuwoh ndiotuwohpoh*, yeſterday I fought; or *wnukuwoh ndiotuwoh*, yeſterday I fight: *ndiotuwauch wupkoh*; I ſhall fight to-morrow or *wupkauch ndiotuwoh*, to-morrow I fight. In this laſt caſe the variation of *wupkoh* to *wupkauch* denotes the future tenſe; and this variation is in the word *to-morrow*, not in the verb *fight*.

They have very few prepoſitions, and thoſe are rarely uſed, but in compoſition. *Anneh* is to, *ocheh* is from. But to, from, &c. are almoſt always expreſſed by an alteration of the verb. Thus, *ndoghpeh* is I ride, and *Wnoghquetookoke* is Stockbridge. But if I would ſay in Indian *I ride to Stockbridge*, I muſt ſay, not *anneh Wnoghquetookoke ndoghpeh*, but *Wnoghquetookoke ndinnetoghpeh*. If I would ſay, *I ride from Stockbridge*, it muſt be, not *ocheh Wnoghquetookoke ndoghpeh*; but *Wnoghquetookoke nochetoghpeh*. Thus *ndinnoghoh* is I walk to a place: *notoghoh* I walk from a place: *ndinnehnuh*, I run to a place: *nochehnuh*, I run from a place. And any verb may be compounded, with the prepoſitions, *anneh* and *ocheh*, to and from.

It has been ſaid, that ſavages have no parts of ſpeech beſide the ſubſtantive and the verb. This is not true concerning the Mohegans, nor concerning any other tribe of Indians, of whoſe language I have any knowledge. The Mohegans have all the eight parts of ſpeech, to be found in other languages, though prepoſitions are ſo rarely uſed, except in compoſition, that I once determined that part of ſpeech to be wanting. It has been ſaid alſo,

that

that ſavages never abſtract, and have no abſtract terms, which with regard to the Mohegans is another miſtake. They have *uhwhundowukon*, love: *ſekeenundowhkon*, hatred: *nſconmowukon*, malice: *peyuhtommauwukon*, religion, &c. I doubt not but that there is in this language the full proportion of abſtract, to concrete terms, which is commonly to be found in other languages.

Beſides what has been obſerved concerning prefixes and ſuffixes, there is a remarkable analogy, between ſome words in the Mohegan language, and the correſpondent words in the Hebrew,——In Mohegan *Neah* is I: the Hebrew of which is *Ani*. *Keah* is thou or thee: the Hebrews uſe *ka* the ſuffix. *Uwoh* is this man, or this thing: very analogous to the Hebrew *hu* or *hua*, ipſe. *Neaunuh* is we: in the Hebrew *nachnu* and *anachnu*.

In Hebrew *ni* is the ſuffix for *me*, or the firſt perſon. In the Mohegan *n* or *ne* is prefixed to denote the firſt perſon. As *nmeetſeh* or *nemeetſeh*, I eat. In Hebrew *k* or *ka* is the ſuffix for the ſecond perſon, and is indifferently either a pronoun ſubſtantive or adjective. K or ka has the ſame uſe in the Mohegan language: as kmeetſeh of kameetſeh, thou eateſt; kniſk, thy hand. In Hebrew the *vau*, the letter *u* & *hu* are the ſuffixes for he or him. In Mohegan the ſame is expreſſed by *u* or *uw*, and by *oo*: as *nduhwhunuw*, I love him, *pumiſſoo*, he walketh. The ſuffix to expreſs *our* or *us* in Hebrew is *nu*, in Mohegan the ſuffix of the ſame ſignification is *nuh*: as *noghnuh* our father: *nmeetſehnuh*, we eat. &c.

How far the uſe of prefixes and ſuffixes, together with theſe inſtances of analogy, and perhaps other inſtances, which may be traced out by thoſe who have more leiſure, go towards proving, that the North American Indians are of Hebrew, or at leaſt Aſiatic extraction, is ſubmitted to the judgment of the learned. The facts are demonſtrable; concerning the proper inferences every one will judge for himſelf. In the modern Armenian language, the pronouns are affixed *. How far affixes

* Vide Schroderi theſaurum Linguæ Armenicæ.

fixes are in uſe among the other modern Aſiatics, I have not had opportunity to obtain information. It is to be deſired, that thoſe who are informed, would communicate to the public what information they may poſſeſs, relating to this matter. Perhaps by ſuch communication and by a compariſon of the languages of the North-American Indians, with the languages of Aſia, it may appear, not only from what quarter of the world, but from what particular nations, theſe Indians are derived.

It is to be wiſhed, that every one who makes a vocabulary of any Indian language, would be careful to notice the prefixes and ſuffixes, and to diſtinguiſh accordingly. One man may aſk an Indian, what he calls *hand* in his language, holding out his own hand to him. The Indian will naturally anſwer *kniſk*, i. e. *thy* hand. Another man will aſk the ſame queſtion, pointing to the Indian's hand. In this caſe, he will as naturally anſwer *nniſk*; *my* hand. Another may aſk the ſame queſtion, pointing to the hand of the third perſon. In this caſe, the anſwer will naturally be *uniſk*, *his* hand. This would make a very conſiderable diverſity in the correſponding words of different vocabularies; when if due attention were rendered to the perſonal prefixes and ſuffixes, the words would be the very ſame, or much more ſimilar.

The like attention to the moods and perſonal affixes of the verbs is neceſſary. If you aſk an Indian how he expreſſes, in his language, to *go* or walk, and to illuſtrate your meaning, point to a perſon who is walking: he will tell you, *pumiſſoo*, he walks. If to make him underſtand, you walk yourſelf, his anſwer will be *kpumſeh*, thou walkeſt. If you illuſtrate your meaning by pointing to the walk of the Indian, the anſwer will be *npumſeh*, I walk. If he take you to mean *go* or *walk*, in the imperative mood, he will anſwer *pumiſſeh*, walk thou.

EDWARDS, JONATHAN, D.D. Observations on the Language of the Muhhekanew Indians in which the extent of that Language in North America is shewn, its Genius is grammattically traced, some of its perculiarities and some Instances of Analogy between that and the Hebrew are Pointed out. Communicated to the Connecticut Society of Arts ans Sciences, and published at the Request of the Society.
By Jonathan Edwards, D.D.
New Haven, printed by Jpsiah Meiggs 1788.
8° pp.15. ~~reprinted London 1788~~.

The very able author of this treatise was not the first to analyze the Aboriginal language of New England, and reduce it to rules, yet his brief work is remarkable for suggesting the radical basis of the Muhhekanew dialect, and exhibiting its structural difference from the Mohawk.
He was however the first to show the affinity of all the Algonquin dialects, and trace the basal relationship of all the Eastern tongues with those of the Long Island, Delaware, Shawnese and Chippeway Indians.
He was eminently fitted for this service to ethnology from his perculiar fortune in being associated with all these tribes.
Commencing a familiar acquaintance with the Mohegans at Stockbridge, when only six years of age, and at a period when the town contained but twelve families of European lineage to one hundred and fifty of Indian birth, his youth was spent with the native boys for schoolmates and playfellows. Out of his father's house he seldom heard the ennuciation of any language bu that spoken by Indian tongue. To him therefore the Mohegan language became his vernacular.
In his tenth year he was sent among the Six Nations to learn their language, and thus, although resident with them for less than a year, became fitted for his work of comparison of the two radically different tongues. The obvious difference between the guttural, harsh and by civilized organs almost unpronounceable language of the Six Nations, and the liquid flowing tongue of the Mohegan and New England Tribes, could not but elicit his attention and curiosity in after life to analyze the causes of this diversity.
The following are the principal characteristics of these tongues he notices: No word of the Iroquois corresponds to any of the Algonquin. The Algonquin has no gender, no infinitive mood, or abstract verb. The action always is associated in expression with the noun, no relative pronouns, no abstract adjective, as quality is always expressed by varying the noun, a different noun being used to express differing qualities of the same thing. Thus, there are no abstract terms for things commonly expressed with relation to other nouns. The Iroquois dialects have few if any labials, the Algonquin abounds in them. It is impossible to express a simple action in either tongue as "John strikes". The action must always be connected with its nominative, and if transitive, in connection with both nominative and objective, and even then by the circumlocutory phrase "John he strikes him Peter".
All these curious philological traits are very clearly analyzed in this treatise.

Field 487

Provenance Park Bernet
Oct, 1971 through P. Decker